

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached four (4) sheets of drawings includes changes to FIGs. 1-4. These sheets, which include FIGs. 1-4, replaces the prior replacement sheets (amendment dated July 29, 2003) including FIGs. 1-4. Additionally, four (4) annotated sheets showing the changes made are also attached. In FIG. 1, a previously omitted reference number (122) has been added; in FIG. 2, an erroneous reference number (222) has been corrected and a previously omitted connector arrow between elements 208 and 210 has been added; in FIG. 3, various reference numbers (304 and 312) have been moved to their proper locations, and the proper number of “icons” have been reflected in the cell 308; and, in FIG. 4, the text illustrated along with the “Search” input (402) has been corrected to match the specification. No new subject matter has been added by these amendments.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

In a non-final Office Action mailed May 18, 2007, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,650,800 ("Benson"). Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

As an initial matter, Applicant has treated the instant Office Action as a non-final Office Action despite both the final and non-final checkboxes being marked in the "Office Action Summary" (items 2a and 2b). This treatment of the instant Office Action as non-final comports with the designation of the instant Office Action as non-final in the PAIR system, as well as the absence of form paragraph 7.39 (see, M.P.E.P. § 706.07) or the like from the instant Office Action.

Additionally, Applicant notes that claim 3 has been amended above to correct form of the claim, and claim 8 has been amended above to correct a typographical error. Support for the amendment to claim 8 may be found, for example, in paragraph 0040 of the instant specification. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3 and 8 are in suitable condition for allowance.

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Benson. Benson is directed toward a graphical user interface module used in security and access control systems. (Benson, col. 1, lines 7-10). Benson teaches the use of various interface modules 90 comprising, among other things, a housing 92 supporting a display screen 100. (FIG. 3; col. 7, lines 3-9) A "touch sensor matrix 102 *which is shown in phantom*", i.e., a touch screen, is provided "immediately adjacent the display screen, and between [the display screen 100] and a user" (FIG. 3, col. 7, lines 18-20; emphasis added) Because the touch sensor matrix 102 is shown in phantom, i.e., broken lines, the reader of the disclosure of Benson will appreciate that the lines illustrating the touch sensor matrix 102 are not, in fact, displayed on Benson's display

screen 100. Various icons representative of sensors or functions that may be performed on the sensors are illustrated in the display screen 100. (E.g., FIG. 5, elements 156, 158, 160; FIGs. 6 and 7) Applicants also note that FIG. 5 of Benson illustrates coordinate indicia along the columns (e.g., A-F) and rows (e.g., 1-5) of the phantom-illustrated matrix depicted therein.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 1, Applicant further notes that the Office Action appears to cite the broken lines representative of the touch sensor matrix in FIG. 7 (no specific portion of FIG. 7 has been cited) as teaching the presently claimed matrix displayed within a matrix area on a display. However, as noted above, the description of FIG. 3 makes clear that the broken lines in FIG. 3 (and, therefore, FIGs. 5-9) are not displayed on Benson's display screen 100, but are in fact representative of touch sensor matrix 102 used to detect user inputs made through the touch sensors (see, e.g., FIG. 4, the "touch sensitive matrix 102" coupled to a "matrix scanner 118" that, in turn, is coupled to a "microprocessor 104"). In short, no reasonable interpretation of the teachings of Benson would permit the conclusion that the broken lines illustrated in FIGs. 3 and 5-9 are displayed on the display screen 100. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to teach a matrix displayed within a matrix area on a display and therefore fails to anticipate claim 1.

Further regarding claim 1, it is asserted, through apparent reference to the coordinate indicia illustrated in FIG. 5, that Benson teaches the claimed matrix (displayed on the display) having row and column headings. Applicant notes that the coordinate indicia illustrated in FIG. 5, even if one assumes they are somehow incorporated as part of the interface module 90, are not provided on the display screen 100 but on Benson's housing 92, as shown. For this reason, Benson fails to teach a matrix displayed on a display and having row and column headings and

further fails to anticipate each and every limitation of claim 1, which claim is therefore in suitable condition for allowance.

Applicant notes that claim 10 includes limitations substantially identical to those discussed above relative to claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons presented above relative to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is not anticipated by Benson and is therefore in suitable condition for allowance.

While being dependent on allowable base claims 1 and 10, claims 2-9 and 11, respectively, also add novel and non-obvious subject matter.

For example, regarding claim 2, the Office Action asserts that Benson teaches the claimed row headings identifying sources and column headings identifying subject matter by virtue of the coordinate indicia along the columns (e.g., A-F) and rows (e.g., 1-5) of Benson's FIG. 5. Ignoring for the moment the fact that Benson's coordinate indicia do not meet the basic requirement that the matrix headings are displayed on the display, as noted above, Applicant further notes that Benson's coordinate indicia are capable of no more than identifying a particular location on the display screen 100, and in no way identify sources or subject matter of the database elements corresponding to the displayed icons. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action asserts that Benson, at col. 3, lines 38-42, teaches "the claimed 'visually perceptible characteristic of one of the icons.'" However, the language in claim 3 noted in the Office Action actually reads, as amended above, "changing a visually perceptible characteristic of one of the icons in response to receiving the icon selection signal." Given this, Applicant notes that the cited portion of Benson fails to mention changing a visually

perceptible characteristic of anything, much less in response to an “icon selection signal.” For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 3.

Regarding claims 4 and 11, it is asserted that Benson teaches receiving a search request input and changing a visually perceptive characteristic of icons that correspond to elements that satisfy the search request. Benson does appear to teach the ability to query its “control system” and to set the brightness level of displayed icons, as noted in the cited passages. However, even assuming that, Applicant respectfully submits that that Benson fails to teach *changing* a visually perceptible characteristics of icons corresponding to database search results. That is, even though Benson teaches that icons can have different brightness levels assigned thereto, there is no teaching that such brightness levels are modified in response to the underlying database elements being identified through a search request. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claims 4 and 11.

Regarding claim 5, Applicant notes that the claim recites “periodically changing, without intervention by the user, the element that is displayed.” To this end, the same portion of Benson concerning the different brightness levels that may be assigned to Benson’s icons (col. 8, lines 40-45) is cited. However, the brightness level of icons is wholly unrelated to periodically displaying different database elements (i.e., the elements underlying the displayed icons) without user intervention. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 5.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant notes that the claim recites an element that comprises a digital image. Stated another way, the element in the database, as opposed to the icon that is representative of the element, is a digital image. In contrast, the cited portion of Benson (col. 8, lines 38-42) refers to the fact that the *icons*, as opposed to the database *elements* they represent,

may be digital images. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 6.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant notes that the claim recites an element that comprises a textual excerpt. Stated another way, the element in the database, as opposed to the icon that is representative of the element, is a textual excerpt. To this end, the sole citation to any teachings in Benson concerning this limitation is to the entirety of FIG. 7. Applicant notes that FIG. 7 does illustrate some displayed text. However, it appears that the text shown in FIG. 7 is for the purpose of labeling specific regions in the display 100 and, in any event, is not a database element being displayed, which database element comprises a textual form. Stated another way, showing labels on a display is not the same as displaying textual database elements. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 7.


Claim 8 (as currently amended) recites “displaying in a title location a title relating to the element” and “displaying in a source location a source of the element” Once again, it is asserted that these limitations are taught by Benson through reference to the entirety of Benson’s FIG. 7. However, Applicants respectfully submit there is neither a title nor a source related to an element illustrated in FIG. 7, much less a teaching of a specific title location or source location. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 8.

Finally, as to claim 9, Applicant notes the recitation of selecting an icon “by superimposing a pointing indicator on the icon.” The cited portion of Benson (col. 4, lines 5-9) cited as teaching this limitation is directed to the on-demand display of a floor plan and overlay thereon of locations of sensors. The cited portion of Benson is simply silent on the issue of selecting an icon by superimposing a “pointing indicator” on the icon. For this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Benson fails to anticipate claim 9.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 13, 2007

By: 
Christopher P. Moreno
Registration No. 38,566

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 609-7842
Fax: (312) 609-5005